

REMARKS

In the Official Action of February 21, 2006, Claims 102-110 were rejected under 35 USC 112; Claims 102 and 106 were rejected under 35 USC 102(a); Claims 92-101, 103-105, 107-109, and 110 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a).

The present communication is fully responsive to the Official Action of February 21, 2006.

35 USC 112, second paragraph, Rejection of Claims 102-110

Claims 102-110 were “rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.” Specifically, the Official Action states that in claim 102, line 4, “the undercut slot” lacks antecedent basis.

Claim 102 has been amended to provide the proper antecedent basis for the “undercut slot.” The amendment to claim 102 has removed the same deficiency cited with respect to claims 103-110

In light of the above claim amendments, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102(a)

Claims 102 and 106 were rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by Zierolf (WO 00/60780). Zierolf, however, fails to describe each and every element of the above listed claims. Specifically, Zierolf fails to describe or show a “circumferential slot comprising an undercut adapted to provide mechanical restraint for an electronic tag.”

Accordingly, for at least the above reason, the 102(a) rejection of claims 102 and 106 is traversed and the claims are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103(a)


Claims 92-101, 103-105, 107-109, and 110 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a). Specifically, Claim 110 was rejected as being unpatentable over Zierolf; Claims 92, 95-96 and 107-108 were rejected as being unpatentable over Zierolf in view of Ohashi et al (JP404019485A); Claims 93-94 were rejected as being unpatentable over Zierolf in view of Ohashi et al and Heisele et al (DE4238225A1); Claims 103-105 were rejected as being unpatentable over Zierolf in view of Forster et al (US6469627); Claim 109 was rejected as being unpatentable over Zierolf in view of Savage et al (US 2003/0156033A1); and Claims 97-101 were rejected as being unpatentable over Zierolf in view of Ohashi et al and Forster et al.

In order to establish *prima facie* obviousness, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974). There is no teaching or suggestion in any of the above cited references of a “slot comprising an undercut adapted to provide mechanical restraint for an electronic tag.” As such, any combination of the above-cited references similarly fails to teach or suggest such claim limitation.

For the above reasons, *prima facie* obviousness has not been established and the rejections of claims 92-101, 103-105, 107-109, and 110 are improper.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,


Tim Curington
Reg. No. 45,944

Dated 7-20-06
Schlumberger Technology Corporation
110 Schlumberger Drive, MD1
Sugar Land, Texas 77478
281-285-4524
281-285-8569 fax